| 1  | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT              |                                  |  |
|----|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 2  | WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI                     |                                  |  |
| 3  | WESTERN DIVISION                                 |                                  |  |
| 4  |  |                                  |  |
| 5  | UNITED STATES OF AME                             | ERICA, )                         |  |
| 6  |  | )                                |  |
| 7  | Plaintiff,                                       | ) No. 3:13-CR-05054-BCW-1        |  |
| 8  | ,  | ) October 18, 2016               |  |
| 9  | V.   | ) Springfield, Missouri          |  |
| 10 |  | ) Criminal                       |  |
| 11 | JEDEDIAH STOUT,                                  | )                                |  |
| 12 |  | )                                |  |
| 13 | Defendant  | . )                              |  |
| 14 |  |                                  |  |
| 15 | SENTENCING TRANSCRIPT                            |                                  |  |
| 16 | BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRIAN C. WIMES              |                                  |  |
| 17 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE                     |                                  |  |
| 18 |  |                                  |  |
| 19 | Proceedings recorded by electronic voice writing |                                  |  |
| 20 | Transcript produced by computer                  |                                  |  |
| 21 |  |                                  |  |
| 22 |  | <u>APPEARANCES</u>               |  |
| 23 | For Plaintiff:                                   | Mr. James Kelleher               |  |
| 24 |  | 901 St. Louis Street, Suite 500  |  |
| 25 |  | Springfield, Missouri 65806      |  |
| 26 |  |                                  |  |
| 27 | For Defendant:                                   | Mr. David Mercer                 |  |
| 28 |  | 901 St. Louis Street, Suite 801  |  |
| 29 |  | Springfield, Missouri 65806      |  |
| 30 |  |                                  |  |
| 31 |  |                                  |  |
|    | Den  | ise Carroll Halasey, CCR, CVR-CM |  |

## October 18, 2016

- THE COURT: Let the Court call the case. This is United States of
- 3 America versus Jedediah Stout. Case No. 13:CR-05054. Can I have
- 4 parties enter their appearance for the record, please.
- 5 MR. KELLEHER: James Kelleher on behalf of the United
- 6 States, Your Honor.

1

- 7 MR. MERCER: David Mercer on behalf of Mr. Stout.
- THE COURT: Good morning. Okay. The Court set this matter
- 9 for sentencing on today's date from a plea that was taken on April 18<sup>th</sup>,
- 2016, in front of Judge Rush. Whereas, Mr. Stout pled guilty to Four
- 11 Counts. Count One, Arson, in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 844(i), a
- 12 Class C felony. Count Two, Arson, again, in violation of 18 U.S.C.
- Section 844(i), Class C felony. Count Three, damage to religious
- property, in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 247(a)(1), Class C felony.
- And lastly, Count Four, Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act, in
- violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 248(a)(3), Class A misdemeanor.
- This Court, on May  $6^{th}$ , of 2016, entered the acceptance of the plea
- of guilty and adjudication of guilt. A presentence investigation was
- ordered.
- 20 Mr. Mercer, have you had the opportunity to review that report
- with your client?
- MR. MERCER: I have, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. The Court did note that there were some
- objections, but they didn't appear to be objections that would impact the
- 25 guideline, is that correct?
- THE MERCER: That's correct. There were two objections.

- One, is the standard objection that I make in regards to additional offense conduct beyond the elements of the offense. I know the Court is familiar with that. And also, I had made an objection to the alleged restitution amount. It is my understanding that the government has a letter from the insurance company they are going to proffer. I have no objection
- 7 THE COURT: Okay.

with the admission of that letter.

- MR. KELLEHER: And Your Honor, I provide the Court with a letter from Columbia Insurance Group indicating that they paid an amount of \$701,971.55.
- THE COURT: And that is the amount that was set forth in the presentence investigation report, correct?
- MR. KELLEHER: Correct.
- 14 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. KELLEHER: And that is the information we have. In terms of anything beyond that, the allegations made by the defense in terms of their objection are really not adequate for me to go into any further detail. That is what has happened as a result of this fire.
- THE COURT: Okay. So does the government have any objections to the presentence investigation report?
- MR. KELLEHER: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: With that said, the Court will find that the guideline range the total offense level is 26. The criminal history category is 1. The guideline range is 63 to 78 months.
- With that said, the Court will now entertain recommendations or argument with respect to a sentence. I'll start with the government. Mr. Kelleher.

MR. KELLEHER: Your Honor, make no mistake about it, the crimes to which the defendant has now pled guilty to are, in fact, acts of terrorism. All too often that term is probably used too lightly, but there is no question that the defendant, by his acts, by his criminal acts, intended to inspire fear, intimidation, and those whose opinions that he frankly didn't share.

There is something about burning a religious institution that is particularly disturbing. Whether it is in 1930's Germany or 1960's Alabama, when you go to place of worship where people go to pay homage to their God, where they educate their children, that is a particular serious and despicable act.

It is more disturbing perhaps that the defendant in this case took an oath to uphold the laws of the United States, to defend the United States, and in fact, served in its military. And it's ironic I suppose that the defendant came back to this country and did things that he was fighting abroad to protect.

In America there are ways to change the laws. Obviously, if you have a disagreement with abortion, there are legal ways to express your displeasure. In America if you have a displeasure with a certain group, there are legal ways you can express that as well. But when you take it upon yourself to burn down religious institutions, to burn down institutions that frankly, in this case, provided services to women that I believe no one would have any issue with. These are profoundly disturbing crimes.

And Your Honor, if that was the end of the story, you would have seen far more counts of additional crimes. Criminal acts, criminal charges that carry significant mandatory minimum sentences. Mr. Mercer, to his credit, did an excellent job in representing his client in

- presenting some very significant mitigating facts in his favor. While the
- 2 defendant engaged in these horrific acts of terror, some of those acts can
- 3 be − I don't know if explained is the right word. But mitigated by the
- 4 fact that he obviously suffers from a very profound mental illness that
- 5 there is some evidence to suggest was developed as a result of his
- 6 service to this country. And the government has taken that into
- 7 consideration in formulating the information to which the defendant has
- 8 pled guilty to. And took it into consideration in offering the plea
- 9 agreement that the government did.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Obviously, Your Honor, the defendant's mental illness has made him a profound danger. And consequently, at this point at least, I believe that it is necessary for a substantial sentence to be imposed so that hopefully the defendant can obtain mental health treatment that he so desperately needs. And hopefully, if this illness is treatable, he can go on and lead a full and productive life with no further acts of terror.

For those reasons, Your Honor, the government recommends a sentence within the sentencing guideline range as set forth in the presentence report. We can only hope that will be enough time for the defendant to obtain that mental health treatment. We can only hope that that will enough time to dissuade him from engaging in any further acts of this nature. I would also respectfully recommend to the Court that following his term of imprisonment that he be placed on supervised release. And in addition to the term set forth in the presentence report, the government would also respectfully suggest the following terms of supervised release.

First, that the defendant shall not possess or use a computer or any other means to access online computer service at any location without prior approval of a probation officer. And that will include any Internet service provider, bulletin board system or any other public or private computer network.

Second, that the defendant shall stay at least 1000 feet away from 3 any facility that is known by the defendant to provide reproductive 4 health care. That would include pregnancy termination services. That 5 the defendant, at the discretion of his probation officer be subject to GPS 6 monitoring at exclusion zones as determined by his probation officer. 7 That the defendant shall have no direct or indirect contact with anyone 8 known to the defendant to provide reproductive health care services to 9 include pregnancy termination or any staff members of such an 10 individual. That the defendant shall not affiliate or associate with any 11 organization advocating violence harassment protests or acts of 12 disobedience involving the provision of reproductive health services, 13 including abortion. And that the defendant shall permit the United 14 States probation office to search his personal possessions or/and to 15 confiscate any contraband, propaganda or other materials related to the 16 provision of reproductive health services, including abortion. 17

Your Honor, obviously, this is a difficult case. As a prosecutor when you engage in these activities, my first inclination is to ask the Court to send a person away for as long as they personally can. I recognize however, in Mr. Stout's case, that there are features that mitigate these crimes somewhat, but clearly the government is profoundly concerned that he continues to impose an extreme danger to not only Muslims and providers of reproductive health, but frankly, to anyone who he disagrees with.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

For those reasons, Your Honor, it is government's position that a sentence within the guidelines is appropriate. And that the terms and conditions in supervise release include the special terms and conditions that I just mentioned. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. Mr. Mercer.

1

MR. MERCER: Your Honor, in this case, the guideline range is 2 63 to 78 months. In addition to that, there is a 60 month statuary 3 mandatory minimum that is in play. It is the intent in my sentencing 4 memorandum and it is still my intent today to ask the Court to grant a 5 variance down to the statuary minimum of 60 months. And I think that 6 there are compelling factors that will support that request. Of course, 7 this Court is guided by 3553(a) in looking at the history and 8 characteristics of the defendant in the sentencing process. 9

Your Honor, this is a troubling case in a lot of respects, some of 10 which Mr. Kelleher has highlighted. One aspect though that I find 11 especially troubling is the fact that Mr. Stout did something of amazing 12 difficulty that to my knowledge no one in this courtroom has ever done. 13 And that is he went to a war zone and he faced death and injury of both 14 physical and emotional to serve us. He went because we asked him to. 15 And he did that to the best of his abilities. And the result of that was by 16 placing himself in harm's way, he suffered concussive injuries to the 17 brain. He experienced things that damaged him mentally, emotionally, 18 and physically on our behalf. He didn't do those things by using drugs; 19 he didn't do those things by engaging in reckless activity, he did those 20 because he took an oath to serve the United States of America and to put 21 himself into harm's way. And he did. And he was harmed. He was 22 injured during the course of discharging his efforts as being a person that 23 assisted in the disposal of emissions and explosive devices. Not 24 something that is understandable to me as someone who has never 25 experienced that. And he did it to the best of his abilities. And even 26 though he had training and experience and he did the best he could, he 27 was injured. And so after serving this country honorably, he came back 28 to the United States to try to make some productive use of the life that he 29

- had now been given, which included things like post-traumatic stress
- 2 disorder and traumatic brain injury and mental illness. These are the
- things that he will struggle with for the rest of his life. Some people
- 4 return from combat duty missing arms and legs. Some people come
- 5 back blind. Some people come back emotionally damaged. Some
- 6 people come back with injured brains. And Mr. Stout falls into that later
- 7 category. And though he has all his limbs and digits, he is nonetheless
- 8 traumatically and irreparably harmed by what he has given to this
- 9 country.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

with.

These cases are difficult, I think, because in large part in my 10 opinion, and I think it is also brought out by the testimony in the experts, 11 the criminal conduct for which Mr. Stout has pled guilty and been 12 convicted is in extricable linked to the harm that he suffered while in the 13 military. It is one thing to wake up in a morning and to coolly and 14 rationally make the decision to engage in criminal conduct. And that 15 certainly entails a level of criminal punishment that is different than 16 those whose criminality is a function of injury and mental illness. In my 17 sentencing memorandum I go to great length to show to the Court that 18 there is a demonstrated correlation between PTSD and criminal 19 behavior. Mr. Stout is who he is today because of his service to this 20

However, it is not that bleak. There are two reasons why I think this Court should have hope that Mr. Stout can go on and live a life that is law abiding and productive. The first is that he desires to do that. And that desire is found in the fact that he has been compliant with the medical regimen that has been prescribed to him for mental health treatment. He wants to do better. He has a strong desire to live a life

country. And he will be tomorrow and most likely for the remainder of

his future, he will struggle with the things that he currently struggles

- where he is free from the impacts of those mental illnesses. And in
- 2 addition to that, as I indicted in my sentencing memorandum, there are
- people in the mental health realm like the people at the Crane
- 4 Residential Care Home who have talked to Mr. Stout, who have
- 5 interviewed him, who have looked at his records, and who in their
- 6 professional opinion who formed the conclusion that he would benefit
- 7 greatly from the kind of treatment that they offer in those kinds of
- 8 institutions.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

articulated by the government.

Now, fortunately, the Veteran's Administration has recognized the 9 sacrifice that Mr. Stout made for his country, because they have granted 10 him substantial VA benefits that are directly related to the injuries that 11 he suffered while serving our country. And so he has at his disposal the 12 financial resources necessary to procure and pay for the kind of 13 treatment that Crane Residential Care facility has to offer him. And 14 even if not them, he has the financial where withal to get the kind of 15 treatment that will be effective in mitigated concerns that have been 16

So Your Honor, when you look at the history and characteristics of the defendant, of course, you should consider his military record. You should consider the sacrifices he made during his military service. You should consider his mental illness and his mental injuries that he suffers from today. You should also consider that he wants treatment, and that there is available treatment that is deemed to be appropriate and effective in his case.

One of the other things I would ask the Court to look at in terms of his history and characteristics are that in the investigation of this case,
Mr. Stout, was very forthcoming and cooperative with the authorities.
He made a confession. He gave a statement. He basically told on himself and made the investigation of this case very simple.

In looking at the nature and circumstances of the current offense, the one thing that stood out to me is mentioned in Paragraph 57 of the presentence investigation report. And it indicates that Mr. Stout had obtained mental health treatment prior to the incident offenses. He had been prescribed medicine. However, at the time of the incident offenses, he was not on those medications. So again, there are people in the mental health community believe that he is treatable. That there is a regimen that could be effective. But obviously, at the time, he didn't do what he needed to do to take care of that situation. But now that he has gone through what he has gone through, he is ready and able to take the medications that are prescribed to him. 

The statute also asks the Court to look at the kind of sentences that are available. And I would submit to the Court that his term of custody leading up to today is significant in your sentencing calculous. I was surprised to learn that today is three years on the nose from his date of arrest. October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013. For 36 months, as of today, Mr. Stout has been continuously incarcerated and that mostly has been in a county jail. And as the Court knows, any jail time is hard, it's unproductive and it's without really any kind of meaningful treatment. Three years is a long time to be in custody and await the outcome of your criminal case. And I think that is important for the Court to consider in deciding what the appropriate outcome is.

The last consideration that I would ask the Court to take into account is what is necessary to promote respect for the law and provide deterrence in justice. The government advocated for a substantial sentence and Congress has insured that by imposing a statutory mandatory minimum of 60 months. I believe that a three month variance to arrive at that mandatory minimum is appropriate. And it will

- get Mr. Stout to a position where he can engage in the kind of treatment
- 2 that I have discussed as quickly as possible.
- Your Honor, all those things taken into account, this is a very
- 4 unusual case. I would ask the Court to grant a variance down to 60
- 5 months and impose that sentence in light of the factors that I have set
- 6 before you.
- 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Any reply from the government?
- 8 MR. KELLEHER: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. Would you client wish to address the
- 10 Court?
- MR. MERCER: Your Honor, at this time he respectfully asks to remain silent.
- THE COURT: Mr. Stout, the Court is to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the statute. In
- doing so, the Court looks to the presentence investigation report. The
- 16 Court considers argument of counsel, motions filed with the Court. And
- in the end, the Court imposes a sentence that it does believe meets with
- the requirements.
- Part of I do have to look and I agree with counsel for the
- 20 government well, let me back up for a second. I do think this case
- does represent kind of a different sort of case than what the Court may
- 22 typically see. On one hand you have the crime as suggested by counsel
- for the government, which I believe is horrendous.
- On the other hand, what I see as I look at you as an individual, the sacrifice that you have made for this country, the very sacrifice that you
- made probably in some part played a role in your condition now and in

- the crime itself. So my intent is always to have a balance. Using these
- 2 factors, balance what is a reasonable sentence. One that is sufficient but
- 3 not greater than necessary. Here, the argument is basically for, in
- 4 essence three months because of the mandatory minimum.
- With that said, any good reason why the Court should not impose a sentence at this time?
- 7 MR. KELLEHER: No, Your Honor.
- 8 MR. MERCER: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Stout, you are hereby committed to the
- custody of the Bureau of prisons for a period of 63 months on Counts
- One, Two, and Three, and 12 months on Count Four. All of those
- 12 Counts are to run concurrent. I think this is a sentence that is sufficient,
- but not greater than necessary. And I think it is a sentence that considers
- all the factors. I looked at the crime itself. I looked at your individual
- characteristics. You know, for many reasons this could have been on the
- higher end. But I do think you have paid a price in the military and the
- mental injuries that came, can be the very thing with you serving this
- country, that could have had an impact on you committing this crime.
- But I still have to balance that against the crime itself. And again, I
- 20 always look for the safety of the general public at large. And part of my
- job in sentencing is always to try to reflect fairness in a sentence. I
- considered all the factors, and I think that the Court did do so sentencing
- you to the minimum of the guideline range.
- Now, upon release from prison, you shall be placed in supervised
- release for a period of three years on Counts One, Two and Three. And
- one year on Count Four. All those counts are to run concurrent. The
- 27 Court finds that you don't have the ability to pay the fine; therefore, the

- fine is waived. Now, it is ordered for restitution for Counts One and
- 2 Two is it this \$701,000?
- 3 MR. KELLEHER: Yes, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: \$701,971.55 is imposed. A lump sum payment in
- 5 the full amount is ordered due immediately. If you are unable to pay the
- 6 full amount immediately, while incarcerated, you shall make payments
- of \$25 dollars or at least 10 percent of earnings, whichever is greater.
- 8 While on supervised release, monthly payments of \$100 dollars or ten
- 9 percent of gross income, whichever is greater, and that is when you are
- released from incarceration. Let me make sure I made this clear. While
- you are incarcerated, you shall make \$25 or at least 10 percent of your
- earnings. Now, restitution shall be paid to Columbia Insurance Group
- which is set forth in the presentence investigation report. The Court
- finds that you don't have the ability to pay the fine; therefore, the fine is
- 15 waived.
- Now, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3612(g) you may be subject to diligent
- and default penalties. Also, you shall notify within 30 days the Clerk of
- the Court and the United States Attorney's Office Financial Litigation
- 19 Unit any name change, residence, or mailing address or any material
- 20 change in your economic circumstances that may affect your ability to
- pay any restitution. All payments shall be made to the Clerk of the
- 22 Court located in Kansas City, Missouri. You shall pay the special
- assessment of \$325 which shall be due immediately.
- Now, while on supervised release you shall do we have I think,
- are there any objection? The Court is going to order the conditions from
- the record which were suggested from Mr. Kelleher. And we may have
- to get that from Mr. Kelleher so we can put that in the J and C.

MR. MERCER: I didn't see that until court today and I do have a few objections.

THE COURT: Sure.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- MR. MERCER: My understanding of the first condition has to do with using a computer. And I don't know that there is anything in the offense conduct section that involves use of the Internet or computer that would necessitate this condition. And I would object to it on the basis of his First Amendment rights. I just don't know that there is a factual basis to support this particular requested condition of supervised release.
- THE COURT: Well, it was the computer, but there was more to it.

  Because I feel that is the argument of the rational basis for having it. I

  know I had it written down.
- MR. KELLEHER: Ultimately, Your Honor, the defendant would 13 have to explain to his probation officer the need for the computer, and it 14 would give probation the ability to monitor his computer usage. The 15 reason for that particular condition is that extremism and all its forms are 16 discussed very widely on the Internet, and that is ultimately what we are 17 trying to prevent. I think that preventing the defendant from being able 18 to reach out and contact other likeminded individuals is extremely 19 important for the term of his supervised release. 20
- THE COURT: How do we monitor that?
- MR. KELLEHER: And again, it would be monitored by his probation officer.
- THE COURT: How does she or he monitor that specifically?
- MR. KELLEHER: We do it routinely in child pornography cases.
  And obviously, the first step would be if the defendant had a computer

- or needed a computer, he would consult with probation. And then
- 2 probation would then have to determine the necessity for the computer
- and then would be able to monitor. And then the home visits, frequently
- 4 what we see is the probation officer going in and checking his Internet
- 5 history and things along those lines. But there are ways, obviously, to
- 6 facilitate his computer use, but also to ensure that he isn't reaching out
- 7 and communicating with religious or other extremist.
- MR. MERCER: Well, Your Honor, the problem here is that there
- 9 is no evidence in this case that he ever did that. And in 2016, much less
- when he departs the Bureau of prisons, and to categorically prohibit him
- from having any kind of online presence or activity, I just think it is over
- broad. In addition to the fact, that this Court has already pointed out that
- it puts the probation office into a somewhat difficult position to try to
- 14 monitor that.
- The second condition that is related to that is not actually assume
- the Internet for purpose of reading, posting, communicating or reviewing
- information involving the provision of reproductive health services. I
- mean, what they are proposing to do is just that he can't ever read an
- article in the newspaper or online about reproductive health services.
- 20 And I mean, that is just overly broad and violates his First Amendment
- 21 rights.

- 22 The other thing and I don't know if the Court wants to deal with
- these all at once or?
- THE COURT: Well, I think 1000 feet from a facility of a
- reproductive center. I think that is a condition, and you can make your
- argument against that. GPS monitoring, I think that is a proper
- 27 condition. You can make your argument against that.
  - MR. MERCER: My concern is just the reasonableness of that.

- THE COURT: Reasonableness of what? The 1000 feet or the 1 GPS? 2
- MR. MERCER: The 1000 feet. 3

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

26

- THE COURT: It's very reasonable. And I think it is related. 4
- MR. MERCER: Well, that one I think has a factual basis. 5
- THE COURT: Right. I mean, object for the record. I'm going to 6 put it as a condition that is standard. 7
  - MR. MERCER: My main objections are with the ones involving Internet service. Then also there is a requested condition that he not affiliate with any organization advocating violence, harassment, protests or acts of disobedience involving the provision of reproductive health services, including abortion.
- THE COURT: Won't you be able to affiliate notwithstanding 13 reproductive health services -- wouldn't there be some type of violation, 14 some hate group? Is it in and of itself on the condition of probation? Somehow, you can go and hang out with these individuals who are as a group, home grown terrorists. I mean, I think that would be some sort of violation. I mean, I don't think any affiliation, if there is a concern 18 related to that; I'm not going to make that a condition because quite 19 frankly, I don't understand. Because I think any time there is any 20 organization that promotes it, I think that somehow would be prohibited 21 on supervised release. I guess, I don't know. So, yes, GPS, 1000 feet, 22 yes. And I think they should have the ability – although I don't believe 23 – I think they should have that general condition, I think there is a 24 concern if you're —what you are putting out on your personal computer 25
  - Denise Carroll Halasey, CCR, CVR-CM United States Court Reporter for The Honorable Brian C. Wimes

related to kind of this reproductive health services. That's troubling. So

- to the extent they can do that. And maybe I can get with but I do think that probation does it all the time how they use a computer.
- MR. MERCER: And Your Honor, I think the simple way to this is the last condition is the defendant shall not write standard threats to anyone which would be a new laws violation, which is a standard condition of supervised release. I think that incorporates all the ones I have objections to. The 1000 feet and the GPS, I understand the Court's position on that. I think the use of the computer is just overly broad.
  - THE COURT: I agree. I think any act that does that in and of itself would be a violation of your condition of supervised release. It seems to me. I would get some report if he is engaged in some conduct without a condition of probation. If nothing else, it's a show cause.
- So to the extent I cleared it up. I don't know if I did. So GPS, 1000 feet, yes. In terms of computer, no. I think the other two are just by nature of being on supervised release.
- 16 Anything else?

10

11

12

- MR. MERCER: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Mr. Stout, you can appeal what I have done here today. You will have 14 days from final entry of judgment to file a notice of appeal here in the Western District of Missouri. If you couldn't afford it, you can ask for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. If you have any questions, you can check with your attorney. Anything further, Counsel?
- MR. KELLEHER: No, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Mr. Mercer?
- MR. MERCER: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

| 1 2    | THE COURT: Is there another indictment that may need to be dismissed?   |  |  |
|--------|---|--|--|
| 3      | MR. KELLEHER: Oh, yes, Your Honor. The government at this time would dismiss the original indictment in the matter. |  |  |
| 5<br>6 | THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Stout, I wish you the best of luck, sir.                                       |  |  |
| 7      |   |  |  |
| 8      |   |  |  |
| 9      |   |  |  |
| 10     |   |  |  |
| 11     | CERTIFICATE   |  |  |
| 12     | I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of   |  |  |
| 13     | the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.   |  |  |
| 14     | November 28, 2016   |  |  |
| 15     | /s/ Denise Carroll Halasey  |  |  |
| 16     | Denise Carroll Halasey  |  |  |
| 17     | United States Court Reporter  |  |  |
| 18     |   |  |  |
| 19     |   |  |  |
| 20     |   |  |  |
| 21     |   |  |  |
| 22     |   |  |  |
| 23     |   |  |  |
| 24     |   |  |  |
|        | Denise Carroll Halasey, CCR, CVR-CM   |  |  |

United States Court Reporter for The Honorable Brian C. Wimes